

## United States Patent and Trademark Office

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

	APPLICATION NO.	_ ] 1	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO
	10/822,790		04/13/2004	Suman Preet Singh Khanuja	033166-028	3252
	21839	7590	09/26/2006		EXAMINER	
			ERSOLL & ROO	MELLER, MICHAEL V		
	POST OFFICE BOX 1404 ALEXANDRIA, VA 22313-1404				ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
					1655	

DATE MAILED: 09/26/2006

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

	Application No.	Applicant(s)					
Office Action Comment	10/822,790	KHANUJA ET AL.					
Office Action Summary	Examiner	Art Unit					
	Michael V. Meller	1655					
The MAILING DATE of this communication Period for Reply	appears on the cover sheet w	ith the correspondence ad	dress				
A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REWHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING  - Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFF after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.  - If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period for reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by stany reply received by the Office later than three months after the mearned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).	B DATE OF THIS COMMUNIO R 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a r riod will apply and will expire SIX (6) MON atute, cause the application to become AB	CATION. reply be timely filed ITHS from the mailing date of this of BANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).	•				
Status							
1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on _		·					
	This action is non-final.						
3) Since this application is in condition for allo	ers, prosecution as to the	e merits is					
closed in accordance with the practice under <i>Ex parte Quayle</i> , 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.							
Disposition of Claims		•					
4)⊠ Claim(s) <u>36-56</u> is/are pending in the applica							
, _ , , _ , , , , , , , , , , , , , , ,	4a) Of the above claim(s) is/are withdrawn from consideration.						
5) Claim(s) is/are allowed.							
6) Claim(s) is/are rejected.	· <u> </u>						
7) Claim(s) is/are objected to.							
8) Claim(s) <u>36-56</u> are subject to restriction and	d/or election requirement						
Application Papers	arer election requirement.	4					
<u> </u>							
9) The specification is objected to by the Examiner.							
0) The drawing(s) filed on is/are: a) accepted or b) objected to by the Examiner.							
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).  Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).							
Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119							
Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).  a) All b) Some * c) None of:  1. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.  2. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No  3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).							
* See the attached detailed Office action for a  Attachment(s)  Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)	4) ☐ Interview S	Summary (PTO-413)					
<ul> <li>2) Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)</li> <li>3) Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/</li> </ul>		s)/Mail Date  nformal Patent Application (PTC)	)-152)				
Paper No(s)/Mail Date	6) Other:						

## **DETAILED ACTION**

## Election/Restrictions

Restriction to one of the following inventions is required under 35 U.S.C. 121:

- Claims 36-39, drawn to a method of making a cow urine distillate, classified in class 435, subclass various.
- II. Claims 40-53, drawn to a first method of using said distillate, classified in class 424, subclass various.
- III. Claim 54, drawn to a lyophilized bioactive product obtained from cow urine distillate, classified in class 514, subclass various.
- IV. Claim 55, drawn to a pharmaceutical composition, classified in class 935, subclass various.
- V. Claim 56, drawn to a second method of using said distillate, classified in class 530, subclass various.

The inventions are distinct, each from the other because of the following reasons:

Inventions I, III and IV are related as process of making and product made. The inventions are distinct if either or both of the following can be shown: (1) that the process as claimed can be used to make another and materially different product or (2)

that the product as claimed can be made by another and materially different process (MPEP § 806.05(f)). In the instant case the product can be made in a materially distinct process such as genetic engineering.

Inventions III, IV and II, V are related as product and process of use. The inventions can be shown to be distinct if either or both of the following can be shown: (1) the process for using the product as claimed can be practiced with another materially different product or (2) the product as claimed can be used in a materially different process of using that product. See MPEP § 806.05(h). In the instant case the products can be used in materially distinct process such as treating a wound.

The methods are unrelated to each other since they differ in mode of operation and are not capable of being used together.

Because these inventions are independent or distinct for the reasons given above and have acquired a separate status in the art in view of their different classification, restriction for examination purposes as indicated is proper.

Because these inventions are independent or distinct for the reasons given above and have acquired a separate status in the art because of their recognized divergent subject matter, restriction for examination purposes as indicated is proper.

This application contains claims directed to the following patentably distinct species: the many different nutraceutical, antibiotic, anti-infective, and anti-cancer agents. The species are independent or distinct because they differ in both structure

Application/Control Number: 10/822,790

Art Unit: 1655

and function. Applicant is required to elect a specific agent, i.e. specific kind of antibiotic if antibiotic is to be elected.

Applicant is required under 35 U.S.C. 121 to elect a single disclosed species for prosecution on the merits to which the claims shall be restricted if no generic claim is finally held to be allowable. Currently, claim 40 is generic.

Applicant is advised that a reply to this requirement must include an identification of the species that is elected consonant with this requirement, and a listing of all claims readable thereon, including any claims subsequently added. An argument that a claim is allowable or that all claims are generic is considered nonresponsive unless accompanied by an election.

Upon the allowance of a generic claim, applicant will be entitled to consideration of claims to additional species which depend from or otherwise require all the limitations of an allowable generic claim as provided by 37 CFR 1.141. If claims are added after the election, applicant must indicate which are readable upon the elected species.

MPEP § 809.02(a).

Applicant is advised that the reply to this requirement to be complete must include (i) an election of a species or invention to be examined even though the requirement be traversed (37 CFR 1.143) and (ii) identification of the claims encompassing the elected invention.

The election of an invention or species may be made with or without traverse. To reserve a right to petition, the election must be made with traverse. If the reply does not

distinctly and specifically point out supposed errors in the restriction requirement, the election shall be treated as an election without traverse.

Should applicant traverse on the ground that the inventions or species are not patentably distinct, applicant should submit evidence or identify such evidence now of record showing the inventions or species to be obvious variants or clearly admit on the record that this is the case. In either instance, if the examiner finds one of the inventions unpatentable over the prior art, the evidence or admission may be used in a rejection under 35 U.S.C.103(a) of the other invention.

Applicant is reminded that upon the cancellation of claims to a non-elected invention, the inventorship must be amended in compliance with 37 CFR 1.48(b) if one or more of the currently named inventors is no longer an inventor of at least one claim remaining in the application. Any amendment of inventorship must be accompanied by a request under 37 CFR 1.48(b) and by the fee required under 37 CFR 1.17(i).

It is also noted that the claims are very hard to read in the file copy. Applicant is asked to resubmit the claims so that the examiner can properly read them.

## Notice of Possible Rejoinder

The examiner has required restriction between product and process claims.

Where applicant elects claims directed to the product, and the product claims are subsequently found allowable, withdrawn process claims that depend from or otherwise require all the limitations of the allowable product claim will be considered for rejoinder.

Art Unit: 1655

All claims directed a nonelected process invention must require all the limitations of an allowable product claim for that process invention to be rejoined.

In the event of rejoinder, the requirement for restriction between the product claims and the rejoined process claims will be withdrawn, and the rejoined process claims will be fully examined for patentability in accordance with 37 CFR 1.104. Thus, to be allowable, the rejoined claims must meet all criteria for patentability including the requirements of 35 U.S.C. 101, 102, 103 and 112. Until all claims to the elected product are found allowable, an otherwise proper restriction requirement between product claims and process claims may be maintained. Withdrawn process claims that are not commensurate in scope with an allowable product claim will not be rejoined. See MPEP § 821.04(b). Additionally, in order to retain the right to rejoinder in accordance with the above policy, applicant is advised that the process claims should be amended during prosecution to require the limitations of the product claims. Failure to do so may result in a loss of the right to rejoinder. Further, note that the prohibition against double patenting rejections of 35 U.S.C. 121 does not apply where the restriction requirement is withdrawn by the examiner before the patent issues. See MPEP § 804.01.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Michael V. Meller whose telephone number is 571-272-0967. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday thru Thursday: 9:30am-6:00pm.

Art Unit: 1655

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Terry McKelvey can be reached on 571-272-0775. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

Michael V. Meller Primary Examiner Art Unit 1655

MVM